

DIVINE RIGHT OF THE PAMPERED

By A. K. CHESTERTON

A WEEK or two ago the B.B.C. staged a T.V. programme in which a group of unemployed took part. It was stressed that they were not a representative cross-section of the unemployed, but as two or three dozen men were assembled in front of the camera there is cause for wonder that the B.B.C. made no endeavour to ensure that they were representative, which would have been all too easy an exercise.

However, the views expressed by the men asked to speak, if they did not represent those of all the workless, did at least represent a trend, and perhaps more than that, the spirit of our unrealistic and unhappy times. Most of them, if offered a job outside of their own skilled or semi-skilled trades, would refuse it. They were quite adamant about that. The divine right of kings is a concept they would scorn, but not it would seem the divine—or at all events the absolute—right of the skilled and semi-skilled to work at their own trades.

COMPLACENCY

If I describe this attitude as unrealistic it is because those who hold it have forgotten, if indeed they ever knew, that this world is a very tough place and that the only absolute right it allows is that of a community hell-bent upon its own destruction to starve to death. It is an attitude created by long years of socialist indoctrination and trade union cossetting. I am not against a sane trade unionism. Far from it. But for collective bargaining, the devil-take-the-hindmost proponents of the Manchester School would have become increasingly despotic the nearer they approached to monopoly. That some sort of balance has been reached, however, does not mean that the world has ceased to be tough or that a highly developed sense of complacency is proof against its toughness.

The television programme, whatever the motive of its promoters, high-lighted this complacency, not only in the belief of the men that they had an absolute right, whatever the circumstances, to follow their own line of specialisation, but also to name their own minimum wage and not budge a penny below it. In a realistic society an unemployed man, asked to state his figure, would think in terms of the subsistence level and

breathe a sigh of relief to be accorded it, at all events until something better offered. Thirty years ago a skilled man would have considered himself fortunate to receive six pounds a week and an unskilled man four pounds ten. Since then the cost of living has soared, and one would expect about fifteen pounds to represent subsistence, with a small sum over for saving or comforts.

What figure, then, did the unemployed men interviewed by the B.B.C. ask for their services? The average, believe it or not, ranged between thirty and forty pounds a week, and one man declared that he would not work for anything less than fifty pounds a week. If a skilled worker can command upwards of £2,500 a year, and if the value of his product, or his part in a product, justifies such pay, then good luck to him. He deserves what he thus honestly earns. The same applies to the semi-skilled worker who is able to justify a wage of £1,500 or £2,000 a year. He is entitled to every penny of what he earns. However, the stark truth is that these men do not at the present moment in time justify such wages. How do I know? My knowledge is based on the simple fact that they are unemployed. They have priced themselves out of the labour market.

This argument has nothing to do with maniacal Government mismanagement, or with our subservience to a financial system operated by racketeers who have woven around our community, as around every other community, a web of unpayable debt—debt created by the lending to it of its own credit, so that our international masters not only live on the interest but rule by virtue of their stranglehold. Our very strong views on this subject are well known to our readers.

THE WILL TO WORK

What concerns us here is something even more alarming, in that whereas a fraudulent financial system can one day be replaced by honest money, and in the meantime corrupts only those who operate it or who today to the operators, the fact that unemployed men are not ashamed to go on the television programme and declare that not only will they refuse to work outside their own trade but that they will refuse to work at all at less than three, four or even five times what it costs to keep themselves and their families alive reflects some grave psychological and sociological disorders.

In a society not degenerate, the man who for whatever reason finds himself out of a job will consider that he owes it to his self-respect to accept any honest work that will tide him over until the power of choice is restored to him. Where this does not happen, where an unemployed man today demands work only at his own trade and at a wage which his unemployment shows to be exorbitant, I do not say that he is personally debased but I do say that the society which has created and which tolerates his attitude is utterly degenerate. Man is a social being and the society which goes flabby in its heart and mind cannot long survive. Let me repeat that this is the problem which concerns me here and not the perilous evils of the financial system or the contemptible antics of the politicians, who climb to office on the backs of the workers and then deprive hundreds of thousands of them of their jobs so

as to ingratiate themselves with the financial bosses—the Wall Street giants reduced in size for the peace of mind of the masses to the diminutive stature of gnomes of Zurich.

There is just one other aspect which deserves a glance. The B.B.C. had to confess that the unemployed it interviewed were not a representative cross-section. That I can well believe. It is incredible to me that all British workers out of a job would call for the moon rather than for the right to work for a square meal and a roof over their heads for themselves and their families until better times prevailed. Why, then, the B.B.C.'s high selectivity? Was it to establish thirty, forty and fifty pounds a week as the norm and so help to bring about the total collapse of our economy? That would well be a long-term Communist objective.

GLUBB PASHA ON THE M.E.

By ISLA ATHERLEY

GLUBB PASHA (Lieut-General Sir John Glubb), who has an unrivalled knowledge of Middle East affairs and a sympathetic understanding of the Arab mind, has been persuaded by friends to write an unprejudiced summary of the recent Arab/Israeli conflict in order to keep the record straight in face of the spate of pro-Jewish reports in the British Press.

RUSSIAN ROULETTE IN THE MED.

In "The Middle East Crisis", a paper-back booklet published by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton at 3/6, General Glubb points out how the present crisis was engineered by Russia for her own purposes. By clever diplomacy in tricking Great Britain and America to declare their hostility to the Arab cause, she has swept the Arab peoples into her own embrace with an eye to obtaining strategic advantages in the Mediterranean area. He stresses the very dangerous consequence of this to Great Britain and indeed to Western Europe since whoever controls the Mediterranean can dominate the European Continent. General Glubb gives a concise history of the Palestine Arabs' justifiable grievance at the establishment of a Jewish sovereign State on Arab territory and he reminds readers of the two incompatible pledges made by Great Britain and her allies to Arabs and to Jews during the first world war. He impresses on readers that it is always necessary to remember that the word "Arab" does not mean a single race; it embraces a cultural group of different racial peoples inhabiting different sovereign States. The inhabitants of Jordan, for instance, are very different from those in Egypt.

Although General Glubb's sympathies are known to be with the Palestinian Arabs with whom he lived for years, he has written a well balanced account of the Middle East situation with its pitiful refugees, its genuine fear of Israel as an outpost of Western imperialism, its strategic importance and its context in the Cold War. He makes a few suggestions for a peace settlement and again stresses the dangers for Europe of alienating the Arab and the Muslim worlds.

Every *Candour* reader ought to invest 3/6 in this little goldmine of information. The author is an expert who does not allow his emotional attachments to impair his historical judgment.

MR. GEORGE PILE

We profoundly regret to record the death in tragic circumstances of Mr. George Pile, staunch patriot and foundation member of the League of Empire Loyalists Committee, who emigrated to Rhodesia some years ago, where he was a power of strength to the Candour League of Rhodesia.

Faithful to duty to the last, George Pile last week fought a bush fire on the estate for which he was responsible, became entrapped and perished in the flames. We salute his valiant memory.

WELL DONE LONDON

London members are distributing thousands of *National Front* leaflets every week.

Result—scores of enquiries each day

How about it Provinces?

Supplies from:

11 Palace Chambers,
Bridge Street,
London, S.W.1.

CUT AND THRUST

THE British Government's betrayal of the South Arabian Federation, which it formed eight years ago, and has subsequently sustained in the apparent hope of being able to hand over power to a stable regime, runs so true to form that I do not suppose the sheiks and sultans whose lives and states are thereby endangered have been taken by surprise. Britain's High Commissioner, Sir Humphrey Trevelyan, a career diplomat who has to take his orders from the Wilson-Brown circus, probably felt more cynical than dishonoured when he went on Aden radio to announce London's willingness to ditch the Federal Government by negotiating with the National Liberation Front.

Why was the N.L.F. chosen, rather than its rival terrorist organisation? That is an easy question to answer. Because it has been the more successful in killing British soldiers stationed in Aden for the protection of life, property and the Federal Government.

What causes me to smile—a smile not of amusement but of contempt—has been the reaction of Duncan Sandys, who had been the architect of the Federation. "Thanks to their cowardice and folly," he declares, "the British Government have now no option but to drink the cup of shame down to the dregs." That would be a suitable attack on the federation-busters had it not come from a man himself notorious for federation-busting.

The Federation bust by the Rt. Hon. Duncan Sandys was that of Central Africa. Yet he has the incredible thickness of skin not only to storm against the betrayal of Southern Arabia but to set himself up as a champion of the Rhodesian cause. His motive is as simple as it is time-dishonoured. He is falling back on a simulacrum of conservatism in his all-out effort to oust that other fake Conservative, Edward Heath, from the Party leadership. Ugh!

One point in passing about the Rt. Honourable Duncan Sandys. He twice denied to me in public that he had told Sir Roy Welensky that the British had lost the will to govern. On making deeper enquiries I find that on each occasion the man lied.

If Duncan Sandys wishes to know the name of my solicitors who will accept the service of a writ I will gladly supply it by return of post.

The Feet, politically speaking, are not a pleasant family. They are, again politically speaking, a very smelly family. But the odour emanating from the one known as Sir Dingle Foot has become intolerable. As the vile creatures of Mau Mau who, after unspeakable ceremonies in the forest glades, set forth to murder European and loyal Kikuyu men, women and children are now honoured as "freedom-fighters", so would this Dingle creature honour as "freedom-fighters" the terrorists who have crossed the Zambesi to bring murder and rapine to families on lonely farms and Africans loyal to the Rhodesian Government. More than that, he would have Great Britain grant them aid. "After all," he declares, "they and we are on the same side." Let it be understood that this malodourous wretch speaks only for himself.

In a resurgent nation any man making a remark so disgusting and so damnable would be stripped of his honours and driven out of public life. Should there ever come a day (which God forbid) when terrorism arises in our own country, the counter-terrorists will know where to look for the terrorist champion. They will probably find him cowering in the spiritual sewers of his own horrified and horrifying little soul. Little did I think the day would come, as come it has, when the Foot for which I had least disrespect was Michael. He at least has never aspired to the Peerage or soiled the accolade of knighthood.

Year in, year out *Candour* has been the only publication in the British world to insist that the prime cause, the basic motivation, of African politics must be sought outside the African continent, or at any rate outside the native African context, among the international financial interests which perpetually bedevil the world's affairs. For instance, we were the first—and as far as I know the only—periodical to indicate the subterranean forces at work in the Congo before Congressman Bruce made his brave and wonderfully detailed exposure of the Lamco racket.

It is with no surprise, therefore, that we note the interests associated with Biafran separatism, as revealed by the news that the separatist leader Ojukwa has spent nearly two million dollars on planes in Frankfurt alone (it would be Frankfurt, would it not Mayer Anselm?) and that a cartel of European arms dealers has supplied Biafra with armaments worth millions of pounds. The *Sunday Times*, greatly daring, records that it is the amount of hard cash available to Colonel Ojukwa which has surprised arms dealers, adding that it is almost certain that the Rothschild Bank in France has lent him £6,000,000 in return for exclusive mineral and oil rights over 10 years. Shell-B.P. are said to have paid a large "ransom". No wonder the question of whether or not to support the Federal Government of Nigeria reduced Harold Wilson to a quivering jelly. Where's the B.F. now who lectures us learnedly that the real issue at stake lies between the Hausa and the Ibo?

Some surprise seems to have been caused by the suggestion that de Gaulle's Canadian policy, revealed by his conduct over there, was formulated on advice from M. André Malraux, now his Minister of Cultural Affairs. Why the astonishment? Did not Mon General once appoint as his Deputy Prime Minister the traitor Thorez, although he had been condemned to death as a traitor for broadcasting from Moscow in 1940 telling Frenchmen to lay down their arms? Malraux, it is true, has warranted no such charge, but his activities in China and the fact that he was a "freedom fighter" in Spain show where his ideological sympathies lie. In much the same direction, one fancies, as those of Guy de Rothschild.

Not, indeed, that London can cast stones at Paris for placing persons thus orientated in key-positions. Remember Burgess, Maclean & Co.! Now comes news that one Derek Bryan has resigned the secretaryship of the Society for Anglo-Chinese Understanding. On what

grounds? That the Society does not back Mao with sufficient fervour. And what had been Bryan's previous position? Not difficult to guess—Foreign Office expert on China and Chinese affairs. One finds them here, one finds them there, one finds them everywhere. But not as Pimpernels!

* * * *

If our fighting-forces had been kept at a level commensurate with our needs as a nation depending on world trade for its livelihood, there might not have been any insuperable difficulty in an air-commando raid to rescue our diplomats who were being roughed-up and humiliated in Pekin. With the possible exception of the Egyptians, the Chinese are the most unmilitary people on earth. Moreover, despite internationalist propaganda to the contrary and their own proneness to xenophobia, they are like the rest of mankind in respecting strength and despising weakness.

When Nyerere's troops mutinied, the single British Marine commando landed at Dar-es-Salaam was all that was needed to restore the situation. Who can say that a lightning descent on Pekin, had we but the means, would not have saved the British "face"? "Oh dear no," shriek the old ladies of both sexes through chattering teeth. "That would have been to provoke retaliation from Mao with his wonderful new H-bomb!" That bomb! Some scientific saps spent days on a Whitehall roof waiting for the fall-out. That none came led them to believe that China's world-famous nuclear scientists had invented what they were pleased to call a "clean bomb". That there was no fall out because of the more probable explanation that there had been no bomb simply would never have occurred to them!

* * *

All right, I am realist enough to know that we lack the military means for any such enterprise, and that even if we had the power our politicians would lack the guts to use it because of the risks involved. Yet the risks in the long term would have been less lethal than those inherent in the course actually taken. Even while the British Embassy in Pekin was blazing, some unspeakable Foreign Office spokesman was quoted by the B.B.C. as saying that the situation required delicate handling because of the value to Britain of her trade with China.

To this grovelling materialism was added a no less obscene farce. Sir Andrew Aguecheek Wilson was flown by helicopter all the way from the Scilly Isles to confer with his Foreign Secretary, Sir Toby Belch Brown. These two majestic warriors put their fatuous heads together to plan a mighty victory. They decreed that no Chinese diplomat in London should be allowed to travel more than five miles from Piccadilly Circus. After dealing this devastating blow, Wilson—well pleased with his valour—returned the same day to the Scilly Isles, where, alas, he did not remain.

* * *

To make matters worse, after the louts masquerading as Chinese diplomats had attacked with choppers and other weapons the London Bobbies guarding their Embassy, our incredibly maladroit Foreign Secretary lent dignity to the incident by paying a Ministerial visit to the scene where the violence had taken place.

Then, back in the Foreign Office, the egregious Brown thought to add to his honours as a warrior by the breadth and tolerance of his statesmanship. He

composed a little *billet-doux* suggesting that Britain and China kiss and be friends. The office-boy at the Chinese Embassy refused to receive it. There is one thing, and one thing only, I share with the Chinese—their contempt. I do not see how any country inspired and led as our own country is led can possibly survive.

* * *

When the Honorary Secretary of the Free Speech Defence Committee asked a Peer of the Realm to sign the appeal for funds to help meet the costs of the defence in the Race Relations Act test case to be heard at the Lewes Assizes, His Lordship said it was not strongly enough worded. "It needs to be much, much stronger", he said. Asked whether he would sign if the wording were strengthened, the Noble Lord said no, he would not sign.

How typical, how absolutely typical, of the modern "aristocracy". By all means encourage "Commoners" to woo a change of contempt of court, but the Noble Lord himself will stay under cover. This is *Noblesse Oblige*—1967 model.

* * *

The deep divisions within the Anglo-Rhodesian Society are likely to develop into a lively row at its impending A.G.M. Much of what I hear about dissatisfaction with the Society's headquarters—delay in answering correspondence, cheques long left without acknowledgement and so on—are internal matters upon which I am not competent to pass an opinion. What does call for comment is the high-handed manner in which the Council, acting as a law unto itself, has reached decisions and laid down policy without reference to the branches or the general membership. This is of public interest because it discloses that very many people joined the Society, and worked hard within it, in the belief that its *raison d'être* was to give the Smith Government's unilateral declaration of independence one hundred per cent support, which they now find they are expressly forbidden to do.

The most they can get out of Lord Cranborne, described to me as "a well-meaning jelly", is that the Society is not *against* the Rhodesian Government, which is mighty handsome of him. Lord Cranborne perhaps discredits the statement in Holy Writ "He who is not for me is against me." What precisely is the benefit of forming a Society to deal with an issue besides which it sits with due pomposity upon the fence?

* * *

The answer is clear enough to those who study the antics of the Monday Club, a Tory outfit which displays considerable dexterity in having its cake and eating it. This feat was first performed when John Biggs-Davison (for whom the description of a well-meaning jellyette may be fitting) got up at a pro-Rhodesian meeting in London—let me emphasize that prefix *pro*—to speak about the "illegal" Smith regime and tell the audience that he deplored U.D.I. Here was a perfect example of a wobbling Monday Club "stalwart" seeking acclaim as a champion of Rhodesia without incurring the displeasure of his Party's leadership.

And that more or less accurately struck the key upon which the Anglo-Rhodesian Society is endeavouring to play its fatuous little piece. Or, rather a piece which would be fatuous were it not that the great financial interests, masquerading in Salisbury as "moderates", have taken it up to sing with gusto. The Financial Left,

which knows well enough how to make use of yellow, red and pink, does not find any difficulty in using a very watered down blue. Yet there are still members of the Anglo-Rhodesian Society who cannot bring themselves to face the facts. Although most of the letters which reached me after what I wrote on the subject last month expressed satisfaction that the facts had been brought into the open, some wrote to me more in sorrow. One good lady, bless her trusting heart, claimed that the A-R.S. had prevented the use of force. The Anglo-Rhodesian Society should place upon its banner the stirring words: "Jellyfish for Peace"!

* * *

Chapman Pincher, whose courage is as reliable as is his research into what goes on, disclosed at the end of last month that the Government is giving consideration to a scheme for encouraging American firms to invest money in British aviation to an extent that would amount to a take-over bid. Our aircraft industry would become a subsidiary of the U.S. aircraft industry and would be fortunate to enjoy the privilege of making some of the component parts. The *Daily Express* backed up its expert with a leading article asserting that Great Britain was about to become the 51st State.

Both the newspaper and its hard-hitting correspondent were then attacked by Mr. John Stonehouse, junior Minister responsible for aviation in the Technology Ministry, who described their patently sincere exposure of a horrifying prospect as "malicious". He denied all knowledge of any such sell-out, whereupon Mr. Pincher, pointing out that Stonehouse was not in the Cabinet, added that from his experience of the utterances of this Administration—"from the Prime Minister's pre-election denial that the TSR2 would be cancelled to Mr. Denis Healey's recent denial of the collapse of the Anglo-French swing-wing plane—it is unsafe to believe anything until it has been denied." He might have added that this does not apply only to the Labour Government. It was a Conservative junior Minister who, on the eve of our scuttling from the island, declared that Cyprus would remain British "for ever." I agree, though, that Monopoly Capital has no more faithful servitor than Socialism and I greatly fear for our future on land, at sea, and in the air.

* * *

The formula devised for the destruction of the European empires was put by somebody, perhaps Baruch, into President Wilson's mouth fifty fantastic years ago—"self-determination". Its use has created the present self-perpetuating world chaos, but it has nevertheless served its purpose. Although, as an example, not one African or Asian in a thousand would have the slightest understanding of the term, the larger part of two continents has been wrested from the paternal control of civilized administrators on the pretext of self-determination and handed back to the jungle, to be savaged and devoured by the wild beasts of Wall Street. Thus are pretty fictions translated into ugly facts.

Nevertheless the pretty fictions remain in the public mind to induce euphoria and conceal the reality. No sane person, if he thought about it, would maintain that Czechs, Poles, Hungarians, Letts, Bulgarians or for that matter Russians, had really determined their own destiny, but the pretence remains. The most recent example of the humbug surrounding the phrase was

when the British Government decided to grant the right of self-determination to the people of Gibraltar and the United Nations, instead of expressing satisfaction, made known its keen displeasure. Why? Because it was aware that the Gibraltarians almost to a man would determine to remain beneath the Union Jack. Yet how many glistening-eyed U.N. fans will perceive that self-determination is intended to mean no more than the right of the International Power Elite itself to determine the destinies of all mankind? Not one.

* * *

I have wondered during the last dozen years or so why I should so often have come under the vehement attack of the *Toronto Daily Star* and now part of the reason may have been disclosed by one Robert Nielsen, a member of its editorial board, in an article wherein he advocates the abolition of the monarchy in Canada. "We the Canadian people, resolved to build a strong nation upon the foundation of our unique history, our diverse origins, and our common faith in the future, proclaim the constitution of the Federal Republic of Canada." That is how Her Majesty's subject (of which particular specimen she would be well rid) imagines the preamble to such a declaration might read, and he asserts that it should happen not later than 1980. The monarchy, he says, confuses foreigners "about who we are". Canadians should feel grateful if foreigners are confused about who Robert Nielsen is.

Nielsen is of an age to have served in the last war. If he did so, and if the customary oath was administered, he would have sworn allegiance to King George VI, his heirs and successors for ever. But the head reproduced in the photograph does not suggest a target for bullets. It looks rather as though it were intended to be sliced by an egg-spoon. His search for a President, it appears, is to secure for Canada a national identity. This former associate Nieman Fellow for Canada at Harvard University would be unlikely to understand that the men who died at Vimy and Hill 60 were in no doubt about their national identity.

* * *

What reason does Nielsen give for his republicanism? "The first virtue of a republic is that it would vest our sovereignty where it actually lives—here in Canada, with the Canadian people," he writes. To which I reply—balderdash. That is where it was vested over a hundred years ago *de facto* and since 1931 *de jure*. If it has been surrendered, it has not been to London but to Wall Street. The further Canada has moved away from Great Britain the more cosmopolitan and nondescript she has become.

This, according to Nielsen, is "apprehensive, imitative, negative thinking which has held the country back". Back from what? He is clearly one of the progressive boys. What a pity he and his kind cannot progress by themselves, because just ahead of them is the abyss. Things were different, he admits, when Canada belonged to a vast, powerful British Empire. But now? Here is the heart of the matter. If rodents were literary animals one of them would produce a book entitled "The Sinking Ship" and that would serve Mr. Nielsen as his bible. But for once the ratty hunch might be wrong. The ship may yet be saved, but not by rats.

* * *

How much profit in pounds, dollars, rands and all the other currencies did the Israelis clear as a result

of their little local difficulty in June? After only a day or two the vast sum of £175,000,000 was forthcoming and the fund-raisers had by then scarcely got to work. Thereafter her Prime Minister presided over a meeting of millionaires, including Marks and Spencer's Lord Sieff and Michael Sacher, City banker Sigmund Warburg, property tycoon Charles Clore, a representative of Isaac Wolfson's Great Universal Stores, two men from France's Baron Edmond de Rothschild, and a flock of wealthy Jews from America, South America, Switzerland, and Japan. Lord Sieff told a reporter: "I couldn't even begin to assess how many millions of pounds the men in that room controlled."

Nor was that the end of the matter. Baron Edmond

de Rothschild gathered together some French Jews to set up a Middle East Peace Foundation. I quote the *Evening Standard*: "The Baron hopes to interest prominent English and American participants in his foundation and has called a kind of summit conference of his Anglo-Saxon opposite numbers which is to take place in Geneva later this month. Among those he has already succeeded in interesting in his project is George Weidenfeld, the publisher. Tomorrow the Baron meets Lord Sieff and Charles Clore in Jerusalem where they have gone to discuss further economic development in Israel." "English" participants, "Anglo-Saxon" opposite numbers! I find these racial descriptions quaint and enchanting. But why no mention of Sassoon the Norseman or Morgenthau the Dane?

PSYCHOPOLITICAL WARFARE

By DAVID FRASER-HARRIS

(Précis of a talk given to the Cerne Abbas, Dorset, Discussion Group)

IT has been said that all disputes and disagreements between nations must be conducted either by blows or by words. Disraeli said: "With words we govern men." Stalin held, what all dedicated Communists still believe, that words are intended to deceive. "Words", he said "must have no relation to action. . . . Good words are a mask for concealment of bad deeds." Lenin boasted that his most powerful weapon was the lie.

Words have been described as "precision instruments as delicate and as dangerous as a guided missile mechanism". Through words comes the power to mould men's minds, and today, thanks to the mass circulation newspapers, the radio and T.V., whole nations can be brainwashed. All our enemies, who are numerous, are making use of these media of mass communication, and it is the purpose of my talk to identify some of these and to expose their strategy. In order to attain their goal of a World Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, the Communists long ago decided that a word war would be far more effective than a world war, particularly in view of the devastating effects of modern nuclear weapons. But so cleverly have they played up the threat of nuclear war that today the West seeks only to be friends with its deadliest enemies. The West wants peace but the Communists want victory. Since Great Britain as well as the United States is what the Communist term "a target country" marked for conquest, the warnings given by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of the F.B.I., that "every citizen has a duty to learn more about the menace that threatens his future, his home, his children, the peace of the world," should be taken to heart by all patriots in this country. As recently as last year (1965) the U.S. House Un-American Activities Committee issued a report on their recent investigations into Communist subversion, in which they stated:

"A nation's defences are only as strong as its people's knowledge of Communism and their will to resist it."

This is of such fundamental importance that I will repeat it.

In this word war the Communists have the monopoly of a weapon which is far deadlier than any nuclear device, for it can do what the H-bomb cannot do—

destroy the soul and spirit of man. I refer to the weapon of psychopolitics. The Communists' definition of the term is as follows:—

"Psychopolitics is the art and science of asserting and maintaining dominion over the thoughts and loyalties of individuals, officers, bureaux and masses, and the effecting of the conquest of the enemy nations through 'mental healing'." (i.e. brainwashing.)

Lenin and Stalin drew up the master plan for global subversion and conquest. It is to be found in Stalin's book *Marxism and the National Question*. Both these leaders regarded the British Empire as the greatest single obstacle to their world plan, for they knew that their goal could never be achieved until the British, and the other European empires had been destroyed.

So Lenin laid down the strategy of attacking the European Powers at their periphery (i.e. their overseas territories) in order to weaken and finally destroy them. Stalin himself, when addressing the 12th Party Congress, said:

"Two things are possible: either we succeed in stirring up colonial and semi-colonial countries of the East, and thereby hasten the fall of Capitalism, or we muffle it and thereby weaken the force of our movement."

They did not muffle it. What we are witnessing in Africa today is the culmination of Lenin's strategy of conquering Western Europe through Africa. "Western Europe without Africa" he said, "is like a plucked fowl ready for the pot". The success of this strategy is now all too painfully obvious, but it would be foolish to attribute this success to the Communists alone. Considerable pressure has been applied by the two other great anti-Colonial forces in the world, the United States administration (under pressure from Wall Street) and the United Nations. These three forces, the USSR, USA, and the UN, have one aim in common: the destruction of the European empires as the first phase of their goal of World Government. The next phase will be the destruction of the European nation States by compelling them to surrender their national sovereignties to some supra-national authority, in the interests of "world peace". Please note that the West is actively collaborating in its own destruction. No physical weapons have been used to bring this about.

CATHOLICISM VERSUS JEWRY

By AIDAN MACKAY

WE have heard, during the past few years, a great deal of the need for reconciliation between Christians and Jews—but considerably less attention is paid to questions of how and why the enmity has been sustained over the centuries. It is true that there have been 'explanations' based on continued persecution by Christians because of the death of Christ; of Christian envy of Jewish intellectual superiority, artistic creativity, and/or sexual prowess; and of Christian searching for a scapegoat for their own failings. These, however, belong clearly to the admittedly delightful realm of the *Just-So Stories*, and not to the world of scholarship.

ACCURATE FORECAST

For the serious enquirer, a new major work* is likely to be of considerable help in following and, therefore, understanding the nature of the feud between Jewry and Christendom. That, despite certain flaws, the book merits serious attention may be seen from the fact that it was first published in Italy over a year before the assembling of the Second Vatican Council (1963), and that its major purpose was to warn of a determined attempt to be made at the Council to declare that Jews were in no way responsible for the death of Christ. How accurate that forecast was we now know.

'Maurice Pinay' is a pseudonym for a group of Catholics—almost certainly priests. Indeed one Masonic newspaper has declared that the authors are the conservative Cardinals of the Roman Curia. Be this as it may, the compilers have undoubtedly had access to many most enlightening documents and sources, and their scholarship would be difficult to dispute. After the work was put into the hands of the Cardinals at the Council, editions quickly followed in Germany, Spain, Austria and South America. The first volume has just appeared in an English language edition, and it is a pity that the standard of translation does not match the importance and learning of the book. The English is maladroitness and difficult and this, in a closely argued and documented work of 700 pages, must irritate the reader—though by no means to the point of marring the real value of the volume. Rather more serious is the occasional lapse from scholarship into speculation or assumption presented as fact, as in:

"But the arrogance of Communism, of Freemasonry and of the Jews goes so far, that they already speak of bringing the next Papal election under their control with the intention of placing one of their accomplices . . . on the throne of St. Peter."

It seems to me by no means improbable that such an intention does exist, but it seems highly improbable "they" speak of it in this way, particularly as there is no suggestion that some private but authoritative utterance has come to the knowledge of the authors. There are few such lapses in this first volume, but they provide such ready ammunition for the hostile and excuse for those who dislike facing unpopular facts, that any future issue should be carefully checked before printing.

After the weaknesses, the strengths. *Plot Against the Church*, in the first volume, gives us a great sweep of history from Biblical days and the founding of Christianity, through the great heresies launched or aided by Jews: Simon the Magician, and Gnosticism, Arius; Julian the Apostate; Nestor; Annacletus II, the Jew who captured the Chair of Peter and reigned as anti-Pope; and the denunciation of Jewry by Pope after Pope and Council after Council. It is seldom that such a wealth of detail, well-documented, could have been made in one volume accessible to the layman.

LATER AGES

Dealing with later ages, *Plot Against the Church* documents Jewish involvement in the origins and financing of Communism, the Illuminati, Freemasonry and Satanism. On this last we learn of Msr. Meurin, Archbishop of Port Louis who quoted the Cabbalist Handbook of Brother Constant, 30th Grade of Masonry, and concluded:

"This report confirms the opinion of almost all authors who have dealt with this devilish magic, that all branches and practices of sorcery have their origin in the Jewish Cabbala."

We hear also of the findings of Nesta Webster, and of the 19th century Jewish writer, Adolf Jakob Franck, Vice-president of the Israelite Church in Paris, who wrote in connection with Jewish devil-worship:

"If in Judaism traces of dark superstition are present, then one must above all seek the cause of the terror which it inculcates through its devil worship."

The chapters on the leaders of the Bolshevik Revolution are particularly full and valuable. Much will be already familiar to readers of *Candour*, but few will fail to find much that is interesting and hitherto unknown. There is given, for instance, the text of a letter from Baruch Levy, of which I quote only the opening and closing words:

"The Jewish people as a whole is its own Messiah. Its kingdom over the universe is obtained through the uniting of the other human races, through the suppression of frontiers and of monarchies, which are bulwarks for particularism, and hinder the erection of a world republic. . . . Then the promise of the Talmud will be fulfilled, that when the time of the Messiah has come, the Jews will have the goods of all people of the world in their possession."

That letter, quoted from Salluste's *Les Origines secretes du Bolchevisme*, was written to Karl Marx.

The second volume of this work, yet to reach us in English, will carry, *inter alia*, a close treatment of the League of Nations, and the United Nations. If it is as wide-ranging and detailed as is this first volume, we are going to have very real cause to be grateful to the authors.

**The Plot Against the Church* by Maurice Pinay, St. Anthony Press, Los Angeles, Calif., 1967.

N. F. CHALLENGES M.P.

IN a recent issue the *Daily Telegraph* published the following letter from Mr. A. K. Chesterton in reply to one by Mr. T. L. Iremonger:

"Sir—Mr. T. L. Iremonger's diatribe (Sept. 4) about infiltration into Tory Associations by "an extremist political movement" has been taken by some people to refer to the National Front. If extremism is nowadays to be equated with ordinary patriotism we certainly will not run away from the title but I would like to assure your readers that we have formed no plan whatever for infiltrating the Conservative party which, in our view, has taken a leading part in the betrayal of British interests all over the world.

To seek to infiltrate it in our view would be about as useful as to take cover under a sieve during a rainstorm.

Mr. Iremonger quotes from Sir Alec Douglas-Home's statement that those who support the Rhodesian Government are traitors to the Queen. As that Government has never renounced its allegiance to the British Crown Mr. Iremonger is wise not to name any organisation which he imagines could be thus described.

However, the communication which Mr. Iremonger has received from some unfortunate patient in a mental hospital suggests the reference about infiltrators may not be to the National Front in so far as ours is a purely political movement, whereas the suggestion in his letter is that some other than a political purpose is being served.

It is unfortunately true that there are people who project their frustrations and aggressions on to scapegoats such as "Imperialist aggressors", "Reds", "niggers", "women" and the rest of it. Is it not possible that Mr. Iremonger's own frustrations and aggressions are visited upon genuine British patriots?

A. K. CHESTERTON,

Policy Director, National Front.

In a reply to a second outburst by Mr. Iremonger, which ignored the facts stated above, the Policy Director wrote the following letter to the *Daily Telegraph*:

Sir: When Mr. Iremonger's first letter about infiltration into Tory associations by "an extremist political movement" appeared in your columns I sent you an official statement, which you most fair-mindedly published, denying that the organisation was the National Front, as some supposed.

Mr. Iremonger then sent you another letter (September 12) in which he neither gave us the clearance to which we were entitled nor involved us except by his studied neglect to mention my denial. Instead, he claimed to have irrefutable evidence which he was prepared to show any senior Privy Councillor. If the evidence cannot be refuted, why is he so highly selective as to whom he is willing to produce it? Should the suggestion still be that the leadership of the National Front has organised infiltration into the Conservative Party I can only say that Mr. Iremonger is being fed on false information.

As his original allegation was taken by some readers

to refer to the National Front, so does Mr. Iremonger obviously intend them to take his statement about intemperate and malevolent people. Intemperate about what and wishing evil to whom?

Surely, sir, Mr. Iremonger's method of fighting a battle is more cautious than brave. It brings to mind Pope's line about the man "willing to wound, and yet afraid to strike".

A. K. CHESTERTON,

At the time of going to press it is not known whether the *Daily Telegraph* will publish the letter.

FREE SPEECH FUND

THE Free Speech Defence Committee announces that the Fund opened to meet the costs of four defendants appearing at Lewes on charges under the Race Relations Act, and so far publicized only in *Candour*, now amounts to about £1,500.

This is not nearly enough to cover a trial likely to be protracted.

While appealing for more funds, the Committee wishes to thank readers who have already contributed—particularly those who have sent in more than one contribution—and the Honorary Treasurer (Mr. Frank Clifford, 11 Links Road, Seaford, Sussex) asks us to pass on his warm thanks to those contributors he cannot himself reach because they have sent in their contributions anonymously.

Donations have already come from as far afield as New Zealand and South Africa. Surely it behoves all our readers in the United Kingdom to follow such heart-warming examples.

MAKE IT A "LORDLY" CHRISTMAS

Readers in doubt about what to give their friends for Christmas could make a worse choice than a copy of the second and revised edition of *The New Unhappy Lords*.

The *de luxe* edition, autographed by the author, costs £3.3s.0d., the clothbound edition £1.5s.0d.

While there is a steady demand for the paperbacks, selling at 10/6d., orders for the more expensive editions have slowed down. Readers are invited to help in the raising of sales (a) by presenting them as Christmas and birthday gifts, (b) by insisting that their libraries have the book in circulation and (c) where librarians refuse to stock it, by writing to their local newspapers complaining of the suppression of a work that is vital to an understanding of Britain's basic struggle for survival.

READ COMBAT

Edited by JOHN BEAN

Obtainable from:—

1 WINDMILL ROW
LONDON, S.E.11